

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were originally filed in the present application.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-20 were rejected in the August 11, 2005 Office Action.

No claims have been allowed.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13 and 15 are amended herein.

Claims 1-20 remain in the present application.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

In Section 1 of the August 11, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 5, 6, 12 and 13 suggesting that limitations in Claims 5 and 6 conflict with each other. Applicants have amended Claims 5, 6, 12 and 13 to clarify the limitations. Accordingly, Applicants request favorable reconsideration and the withdrawal of the objection to Claims 5, 6, 12 and 13.

In Sections 2 and 3 of the August 11, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 8, 15 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0129980 A1 to *Sayeedi* (the "Sayeedi reference") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0248603 A1 to *Canoy* (the "Canoy reference"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Sayeedi reference discloses a system for registering a mobile station wherein the registration is *initiated by a radio access network (RAN)*. See Sayeedi reference, Abstract and paragraph [0013]. The Canoy reference discloses a method of *communicating broadband data* from a transmitter to a plurality of terminals. See Canoy reference, paragraph [0008]. The Canoy

reference discloses an access terminal which sends *a registration message for a logical channel over a traffic channel* on a reverse link after *receiving a broadcast logical channel* from a forward link. *Id.* at paragraph [0032].

Neither the Sayeedi nor the Canoy references, taken individually or in combination, teaches or makes obvious, for example, an apparatus for providing *mobile station registration* in a traffic channel, wherein the apparatus comprises at least one base station that is capable of *receiving in a traffic channel* at least one mobile station registration message *initiated from at least one mobile station*, as required by amended Claim 1. Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation in the Sayeedi or the Canoy references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively and non-inventively combine and *seek out* other discrete elements as required by amended Claim 1. Claim 1 therefore contains unique and non-obvious limitations over the art cited and is thus patentably distinguishable. Applicants therefore respectfully request favorable reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 1.

Similarly, with regards to Claim 8, neither the Sayeedi nor the Canoy references, taken individually or in combination, teaches or makes obvious, for example, a wireless communication system comprising at least one base station of said plurality of base stations that is capable of *receiving in a traffic channel at least one mobile station registration message initiated from at least one mobile station* of said plurality of mobile stations, as required by amended Claim 8. Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation in the Sayeedi or the Canoy references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively and non-inventively combine and *seek out* other discrete elements as required by

amended Claim 8. Claim 8 therefore contains unique and non-obvious limitations over the art cited and is thus patentably distinguishable. Applicants therefore respectfully request favorable reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 8.

In addition, neither the Sayeedi nor the Canoy references, taken individually or in combination, teaches or makes obvious, for example, a method for registering at least one mobile station in said wireless communication system, wherein the method comprises the step of *initiating and sending from said at least one mobile station at least one mobile station registration message in a traffic channel to at least one base station*, as required by amended Claim 15. Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation in the Sayeedi or the Canoy references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively and non-inventively combine and *seek out* other discrete elements as required by amended Claim 15. Claim 15 therefore contains unique and non-obvious limitations over the art cited and is thus patentably distinguishable. Claim 20 depends from allowable Claim 15 and is thus also allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 15 and 20.

In Section 4 of the August 11, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Sayeedi reference and the Canoy reference as applied to Claims 1, 8 and 15 above, and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0147057 A1 to *LaDue* (the “LaDue reference”). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The LaDue reference discloses that *if a virtual transaction terminal (VTT) has not previously registered as a roamer*, the VTT sends a registration increment to the home location registrar (HLR) associated with the mobile subscriber ISDN (MSISDN) via the signaling system number 7 (SS#7 or SS7) network. *See* LaDue reference, paragraph [0207]. There is no suggestion or motivation in the Sayeedi, Canoy or LaDue references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively and non-inventively combine and *seek out* other discrete elements as required by Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17. Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17 therefore contain unique and non-obvious limitations over the art cited and are thus patentably distinguishable. Moreover, (1) Claims 2, 4, 5, ultimately depend from allowable Claim 1; (2) Claims 9, 11 and 12 ultimately depend from allowable Claim 8; and (3) Claims 16 and 17 ultimately depend from allowable Claim 15. Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17 are thus also allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request favorable reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17.

In Section 5 of the August 11, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Sayeedi reference and the Canoy reference as applied to Claims 1 and 8 above, and in further view of the LaDue reference. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In support of the rejection in Section 5, the Examiner takes Official Notice of several propositions without adequate support. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that there is no suggestion or motivation in the Sayeedi, Canoy or LaDue references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively and non-inventively combine and *seek out* other discrete elements as required by

Claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 14. Claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 14 therefore contain unique and non-obvious limitations over the art cited and are thus patentably distinguishable. Moreover, (1) Claims 3, 6 and 7 ultimately depend from allowable Claim 1; and (2) Claims 10, 13 and 14 ultimately depend from allowable Claim 8. Claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 14 are thus also allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request favorable reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 14.

In Section 6 of the August 11, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Sayeedi reference and the Canoy reference as applied to Claim 15 above, in further view of the LaDue reference and in further view of well known prior art (MPEP §2144.03). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In support of the rejection in Section 6, the Examiner takes Official Notice of several propositions. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that there is no suggestion or motivation in the Sayeedi, Canoy or LaDue references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively and non-inventively combine and *seek out* other discrete elements as required by Claims 18 and 19. Claims 18 and 19 therefore contain unique and non-obvious limitations over the art cited and are thus patentably distinguishable. Moreover, Claims 18 and 19 ultimately depend from allowable Claim 15 and are thus also allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 18 and 19.

SUMMARY

For the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of pending claims and that this Application be passed to issue. If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *jmockler@davismunck.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: 7 Nov 2005

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
Phone: (972) 628-3600
Fax: (972) 628-3616
E-mail: *jmockler@davismunck.com*



John T. Mockler
Registration No. 39,775